

## REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

**1-2.** Claims 1-13 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,240,361 to Ise et al (hereinafter "Ise").

### Claim 1

Claim 1 of the present invention recites a navigation system for use in a motor vehicle. The system includes "*a navigation computing unit that receives the first navigation system position signal, and transmits onto the data bus (i) a first position signal indicative of the position of a trip starting location, (ii) a second position signal indicative of a trip destination location, and (iii) the first navigation system position signal*" (cl. 1). The system also includes a monitor unit having a memory device that includes map data, and monitor computing unit. The monitor computing unit receives from the data bus: (i) the first position signal, (ii) the second position signal and (iii) the received navigation system position signal, and accesses the memory device to generate initial image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the current position of the navigation system. Claim 1 recites that "*the navigation computing unit receives a second navigation position signal indicative of a new position of the navigation system and transmits the second navigation position signal over the data bus to the monitor computing unit, which generates revised image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the updated position of the*

*navigation system, which is provided for display on said display device.” (cl. 1).*

Significantly, the navigation system of claim 1 includes a navigation computing unit and a monitor computing unit. As set forth in claim 1, the monitor computing unit receives position data from the navigation computing unit, and generates initial image data that is displayed to a user.

In contrast, Ise discloses only a single computing unit - the CPU 10. That is, Ise fails to disclose a navigation system that includes: (i) a navigation computing unit and (ii) a monitor computing unit. Ise simply discloses a single CPU (see CPU 10 in FIG. 1). The Official Action contends that col. 4, lines 35-43 discloses the monitor computing unit as set forth in claim 1. However, a fair and proper reading of col. 4, lines 35-43 indicates it discloses only scrolling, and that the map changes the position of the names of locations displayed on the map. Significantly, Ise discloses a only a single computing unit - the CPU 10.

It is now admitted in the Official Action that Ise discloses one computing unit as claimed (Official Action, pg. 3). However, it is then alleged “[s]o, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use two different units in order to share responsibility and provide faster response.” (Official Action, pg. 3). However, a prima facie obviousness rejection has not been presented. There is nothing on the record to indicate why a skilled person would have modified the structure disclosed in Ise based upon the teaching of Ise or a suggestion in the prior art. An obviousness rejection must include a statement regarding where the alleged suggestion is in prior art. “*Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, [t]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art*

*suggested the desirability of the modification.’’* In re Laskowski, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989), citing In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In the present case the Official Action is lacking the necessary factual and non-conclusionary reasoning regarding why one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, would have been motivated to modify Ise as suggested. It is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 of the present invention also recites a navigation system for use in a motor vehicle. The navigation system recited in claim 7 includes: (i) a navigation computing unit and (ii) *“means responsive to (i) said first position signal, (ii) said second position signal and (iii) said received navigation system position signal and said map data, for generating initial image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the current position of the navigation system;”* (cl. 1). As set forth above regarding claim 1, Ise simply discloses a system that includes a single computing unit (see FIG. 1). Claim 7 is patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

#### Claim 13

Claim 13 recites a method of generating an image for display by a motor vehicle navigation system that includes a navigation computing unit, a data bus and a monitor unit. As set forth above, Ise neither discloses nor suggests both a navigation computing unit and monitor unit. Specifically, Ise neither discloses nor suggests:

“transmitting onto said data bus from the navigation computing unit (i) a

first position signal indicative of the position of a trip starting location, (ii) a second position signal indicative of a trip destination location, and (iii) said first navigation system position signal;

receiving at the monitor unit said first position signal, said second position, and said first navigation system position signal;

generating, at the monitor unit, initial image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination location and the current position of the navigation system; and

displaying an initial image indicative of said initial image data.” (emphasis added, cl. 13).

That is, Ise neither discloses nor suggests utilizing a navigation computing unit and a monitor unit as set forth in claim 13 to generate and display an initial image. Again, the conclusionary allegation “[s]o, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use two different units in order to share responsibility and provide faster response” (Official Action, pg. 3) is simply incapable of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

3. Claims 1-13 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view disclosed in U.S. Patent 5,821,880 to Morimoto et al (hereinafter “Morimoto”).

#### Claim 1

The Official Action contends that Morimoto discloses in col. 6, lines 45-55 a navigation computing unit as set forth in claim 1 (see Official Action, pg. 4). However, col. 6, lines 45-55 of Morimoto simply discloses receiving a starting location and a destination location, and computing a midway point. In addition, the abstract of Morimoto simply discloses how the system detects an off-route condition and then prompts the driver to determine if the driver wants to recompute the route. Specifically, the abstract of Morimoto discloses re-searching for a new route only when initiated by the driver in response to a detected off-route condition. In contrast,

the system recited in claim 1 of the present invention employs a navigation computing unit and a monitor unit that efficiently cooperate (i.e., share data) as set forth in the claim 1, to display an initial image and subsequently display an image indicative of revised image data. It is finally recognized in the Official Action that Morimoto fails to disclose two computing units. However, it is then alleged “[s]o, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use two different units in order to share responsibility and provide faster response.” (Official Action, pg. 5). However, a prima facie obviousness rejection has not been presented. There is nothing on the record to indicate why a skilled person would have added two computing units in view of the structure disclosed in Morimoto. An obviousness rejection must include a statement regarding where the alleged suggestion is in prior art. *“Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, ‘[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.’”* In re Laskowski, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989), citing In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In the present case the Official Action is lacking the necessary factual and non-conclusionary reasoning regarding why one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, would have been motivated to modify Morimoto as suggested. It is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 recites a motor vehicle navigation system that includes a navigation computing system and “means ... for generating”. Morimoto neither discloses nor suggests a navigation



computing system that is partitioned in this matter. As set forth above, col. 6, lines 45-55 of Morimoto simply discloses receiving a starting location and a destination location, and computing a midway point. In addition, the abstract of Morimoto simply discloses how the system detects an off-route condition and then prompts the driver to determine if the driver wants to recompute the route.

Therefore, Morimoto is incapable of rendering claim 7 obvious.

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites a method of generating an image for display by a motor vehicle navigation system that includes a navigation computing unit, a data bus and a monitor unit. This claim is patentable for at least all reasons set forth above with respect to Morimoto.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick J. O'Shea  
Reg. No. 35,305  
Gauthier & Connors LLP  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300  
Boston, MA 02110  
(617) 426-9180, Ext. 121

**RECEIVED**

**MAR 17 2004**

**GROUP 3600**